

Public Testimony

Raised Bill Number 931 – An Act Concerning the Definition of Hoisting Equipment

Submitted by: Michael Moconyi, Executive Director, Connecticut Chapter, NECA

Good afternoon Senator Hartley, Representative Dargan and members of the Public Safety and Security Committee. My name is Michael Moconyi and I am the Executive Director, Connecticut Chapter, National Electrical Contractors Association (CT Chapter NECA). Our organization represents union electrical construction firms who employ upwards of 2,000 licensed electricians throughout the state.

I am here today to express concern over **Raised Bill No. 931 – An Act Concerning the Definition of Hoisting Equipment.** Specifically our industry is opposed to the proposed language to reduce the lifting capacity from 5 tons to 500 pounds.

For decades our licensed and trained craftspeople have been permitted to operate equipment on job sites that would be affected by this legislation. The equipment is used to efficiently and effectively move materials necessary to complete the job installation.

If Raised Bill No. 931 is enacted a competitive advantage will be lost by the employers I represent because they will be forced to hire licensed hoisting operators who will not be permitted to participate in the installation of the electrical materials because of the current electrical licensing laws.

As it stands today our industry is heavily regulated. All E-1 and E-2 license holders must complete annual certified education requirements of a minimum of 7 hours in order to renew their license. These CEUs are completed by the individual outside of the normal work week at his / her own expense. Additionally OSHA has many safety standards that our industry complies with, such as OSHA 10 and OSHA 30 training, which require off-site training courses to be completed. The enactment of SB 931 could further demand redundant training and licensing fees be applied to our industry for no additional purpose other than to raise revenue or redistribute work assignments which ultimately add cost to the final product paid for by the owner.

If this is a matter of requiring licensing or training for individuals currently not under any DCP licensed craft our industry may reconsider the proposal, however a clear carve out should be established for any DCP licensed trade where the tradesmen receives the appropriate training. Our industry we believe would and must fall under that type of carve out.

In closing thank you for the opportunity to testify on SB 931 today and restate our industries objection to the current proposed language raised in SB 931.